

**AFTER FINAL
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE**

R E M A R K S

II. Claims 30-31 have been canceled, Claims 24, 27-29 have been amended; where the canceled claims have been rewritten into a new independent claim 32 and two dependant claims 33 and 34. A signed Terminal Disclaimer to obviate a double patenting rejection of Claims 24-31 over a prior patent, under 37 CFR 1.321 (b) is hereby attached along with the fee as provided under 37 CFR 1.20(d). Examiner is requested to remove the requirement of the Terminal Disclaimer for the amended claims and for the new claims.

Claims 24-26, 28 , 31 § 103 (a) Rejected
over Hillary IVO Conway

III. As stated in MPEP Section 2143, "*The prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach all the claimed limitations. . . all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. . . All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of the claim against the prior art. . . When evaluating claims for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103, all the limitations of the claims must be considered and given weight, including limitations which to not find support in the specification as originally filed (i.e. new matter).*"

Applicant claims now teach: the hinge and clamping means having "a dimension is roughly 3 – 5 inches wide in the x-direction". Antecedent support for these new claim words are found in Fig. 5, and in the text of the specification. When combined with the other claim elements, applicant's claims are not suggested in Hillary, Conway, or generally known to one with an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Therefore, Claims 24-26, 28 now appear non-obvious under the meaning of 35 U.S.C 103(a).

Claim 29 Rejected Under § 103(a)
Hillary IVO Conway and Park

Claim 29, which is dependent on Claim 28, teaches "the flat panel display assembly is adapted to include a computer system and battery power . . . adapted to be removable . . . such that the display assembly can be operational without connection to elements (b) - (c)." However, Conway, Park and Hillary fail to suggest the function of removing the display from their

**AFTER FINAL
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE**

apparatus. Hillary, Conway, Park or other known prior art do not suggest removing a flat panel display from the specific apparatus taught in applicant's Claim 28. Therefore, Claim 29 appears non-obvious under the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claim 27 and 30 Rejected Under § 103(a)

Makita IVO Nagaoka

Applicant's independent Claim 27 now teaches "a panel support pivot and clamping means . . . having " a dimension is roughly 3 – 5 inches wide in the x-direction" [element d]. Antecedent support for these words are found in applicant's Fig. 5 and specification text. When element (d) is combined with the other elements, applicant's claims are not suggested in Makita, Nagaoka or generally known in the art. Even if Mikita is combined with Nagaoka, all the elements with the limitations of Claim 27 are not present. Therefore, for the above reason, Claim 27 appear non-obvious under the meaning of U.S.C § 103 (a).

Request For Notice Of Allowance

V. Claims 24 - 34 particularly point out the inventions of the applicant, and the claims are novel, and non-obvious under the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 102 and § 103. No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully submits the no new issues have been added. Thus for all the above reasons, a Notice of Allowance is most respectively solicited.

Sincerely,



Richard J. Ditzik
Applicant Pro Se

307 Surrey Drive
Bonita, CA 91902
(619) 661-2252

Date: 4-8-99